Amendment Dated: January 24, 2005

Reply to Office Action mailed September 24, 2004

Attorney Docket No. 3036/50901

REMARKS

In response to the objection to the specification set forth in paragraph 1 of

the Office Action, Applicants have revised the specification by incorporating

appropriate headings therein, as suggested. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully

submit that the specification is currently in proper form for prosecution in the

United States.

Claims 1-10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable

over Wallace et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,590,881) in view of Popovic (U.S. Patent No.

6,567,482) while Claim 11 has been rejected over the same two references and

further in view of Wang (U.S. Patent No. 6,606,309). Finally, Claim 12 has been

rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Dent et al (U.S. Patent

No. 6,243,587) in view of Wallace et al. However, for the reasons set forth

hereinafter, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims which remain of

record in this application distinguish over the cited references, whether

considered separately or in combination.

The present invention is directed to an improved method for

synchronization of base stations within a telecommunications system which

includes a plurality of "cells", each of which has a fixed base station situated

therein, together with at least one mobile station. At least one channel is

provided for usage in the telecommunication cell, and according to the invention,

Page 9 of 17

Amendment Dated: January 24, 2005

Reply to Office Action mailed September 24, 2004

Attorney Docket No. 3036/50901

that channel is used for transmission of a synchronization signal from a first

base station to the other base stations within the telecommunication system

(which are within transmission range). Thereafter, for each base station, the

time differences between corresponding time slots transmitted by the base

station and received from respective other base stations are calculated. Finally,

the synchronization signals of the respective base stations are adjusted according

to the calculated time differences. Claim 1 of the present application further

recites that the at least one channel is a random access channel transmitted at a

frequency within a band of frequencies that is provided for communications with

mobile stations.

These features give rise to certain technical advantages, such as described,

for example, at page 15, lines 15-20 of the specification. The random access

channel (RACH) is usually used for transmissions from the mobile stations to

initiate communications as noted in the specification at page 5, lines 1-3. In the

method of the present invention, however, each base station "steals" RACH time

slots away from the mobile terminals in order to synchronize with other base

stations. (See, for example, page 6, lines 3-24 of the specification.)

In particular, the method according to Claim 1 recites the following steps:

"b) transmitting a synchronization signal in a given time

slot of the at least one channel, the transmission being from each

Page 10 of 17

Amendment Dated: January 24, 2005

Reply to Office Action mailed September 24, 2004

Attorney Docket No. 3036/50901

of the plurality of base stations to remaining base stations within

the telecommunication system which are within transmission

range of each respective base station; and

c) for each base station, calculating respective time

differences between corresponding time slots transmitted by the

base station and received from respective other base stations

within transmission range of the base station...."

The Wallace et al reference discloses a method for synchronization of a

wireless communication system. In particular, Wallace et al describes systems

which operate during the "normal operation of an IS-95 CDMA communication

system", as noted, for example, at Column 4, lines 24-27. Such normal operation

would not include transmission of the Random Access Channel by base stations,

since this channel is normally used for communication from mobile stations to

the base stations.

Wallace et al suggests the possibility of a base station sending a short

signal at high power in the mobile transmit band. (See, for example, Column 4,

lines 51-54; Figure 3 and associated description; and Column 10, line 10 to

Column 12, line 44.) Short probe signals are transmitted from a base station on

the mobile station transmit frequency. A set of timing error values is derived

from signal timing, allowing for propagation time over the known distances

Page 11 of 17

between the base stations. (See Column 10, lines 28-37.) These error values are

then used to adjust the timing of the base stations. The base stations may agree

to a timing of these probe signals with the base station controller. The difference

between this expected time and the actual time of receipt of the probe defines the

time error in one base station, which must be corrected for the effect of the signal

propagation time. (See Column 10, line 60 to Column 11, line 8.)

Wallace et al, it should be noted, discloses direct measurement of timing

between base stations. According to the disclosure, one base station may remain

quiet while it receives transmissions from other base stations. Using the timing

of the reception of these signals, and a priori knowledge of the location of the

base stations, the timing errors may be calculated and compensated. A base

station sends a short signal in a mobile transmit band. The time of arrival of

this signal measured by surrounding base stations and time errors between pairs

of base stations are calculated.

If direct base-to-base measurement is not possible, a fixed mobile station

may be placed in the handoff region between the isolated cell and another cell.

The fixed mobile station may perform measurement of base station pilots, or may

send a burst transmission at a specified time and power, to be measured by the

two "handoff" base stations.

Page 12 of 17

Amendment Dated: January 24, 2005

Reply to Office Action mailed September 24, 2004

Attorney Docket No. 3036/50901

As is apparent from the foregoing brief description, Wallace et al does not

teach or suggest the use of a given time slot of the random access channel, itself

intended for uplink signaling from a mobile station to a base station, for

transmission of synchronization signals from one base station to other base

stations. Accordingly, the invention defined in Claim 1 distinguishes over

Wallace et al, based on at least these features.

Popovic, on the other hand, teaches the provision of RACH channels,

arranged in time-slots, for mobile stations to send signals to base stations, to

enable uplink (mobile station to base station) synchronization. The present

invention, however, does not utilize such channels for uplink.

Popovic disclose characteristics of the random access channel itself, but

does not describe the application of the random access channel to base station

synchronization.

The Office Action states that because Wallace et al discloses a UMTS

system with base station and mobile stations, while Popovic discloses a RACH

channel, then it would be obvious to use the RACH channel in Popovic in the

UMTS system of Wallace et al to enable mobile stations to transmit to base

stations. Assuming for the sake of the present discussion that this

characterization is correct, Applicants note that it does not describe the subject

matter of the present application as defined in the claims.

Page 13 of 17

Amendment Dated: January 24, 2005

Reply to Office Action mailed September 24, 2004

Attorney Docket No. 3036/50901

That is, the present invention relates to mutual synchronization of base

stations, and not to the synchronization of mobile stations with base stations.

According to Claim 1 of the present application, the invention provides that base

stations communication between themselves using RACH time slots, similar to

those described in Popovic for use by mobile stations.

As described at page 6, line 3 to page 8, line 14 of the present application

this may be performed by base stations "stealing" RACH time slots away from

the mobile stations, for their own use, or by allocating RACH slots for use by the

base stations. Such use is not contemplated in Popovic, which contemplates only

the use of RACH channels by mobile stations, for their synchronization with the

serving base station. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1,

and therefore all of Claims 1-3 and 5-10 (Claim 4 having been cancelled)

distinguish over the cited combination of Wallace et al and Popovic.

With regard to Claim 5, Applicants acknowledge that it is known that the

random access channel (RACH) may comprise one time slot per TDMA frame.

The invention, however, relates to the use of this RACH channel by base

stations, in a manner which is not suggested by the prior art.

Claim 12 has been rejected as unpatentable over Dent et al in view of

Wallace et al. With regard to this ground of rejection, however, Applicants note

that Claim 12 requires the scheduling of synchronization measurements for each

Page 14 of 17

Amendment Dated: January 24, 2005

Reply to Office Action mailed September 24, 2004

Attorney Docket No. 3036/50901

of the base stations using a random access channel, transmitting a signal to

three synchronized base stations, comparing the received signals with timing

signals in each of those base stations, and using this comparison to locate the

mobile station. Thus, it should be noted that only one transmission is required

from the mobile station with the time differences of arrival at three base stations

being sufficient to locate the mobile station.

Dent et al, on the other hand, discloses a method and system for

determining the position of a mobile transmitter unit which operates on phase

differences and signals from two different base stations, to derive a hyperbolic

locus of mobile station position. Another pair of base stations can be used to give

a second hyperbolic locus. The intersection points of these loci provide a position

of the mobile station. The frequencies used may represent a random access

channel and a traffic channel. (See Column 3, lines 16-17.)

Claim 12 requires as a first step, the synchronization of base stations

using a random access channel. This technique is neither described nor

suggested in either Wallace et al or Dent et al, cited in respect of Claim 12.

Moreover, the invention of Claim 12 further requires only a single transmission

from the mobile station, which is sufficient to provide the location of the mobile

station. Such limited information, however, would be insufficient in the system

of Dent et al.

Page 15 of 17

Amendment Dated: January 24, 2005

Reply to Office Action mailed September 24, 2004

Attorney Docket No. 3036/50901

Dent et al requires transmissions from the mobile station on both first and

second frequencies, to two receiving stations. The phases of the signals are

measured, to provide a range difference. Such stations are required to define

each hyperbolic locus. At least two pairs of base stations are required.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Dent et al, either by itself, or in

combination with Wallace et al, does not teach or suggest the subject matter of

Claim 12 of the present application, in which the base stations are known to be

synchronized, so that a pair of base stations will provide a locus of the mobile

station, and a third base station will be sufficient to accurately locate the mobile

station from a single transmission of the mobile station.

In light of the foregoing remarks, this application should be in condition

for allowance, and early passage of this case to issue is respectfully requested. If

there are any questions regarding this amendment or the application in general,

a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated since this should

expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.

If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as

a petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response, and

Page 16 of 17

Serial No. 10/069,269 Amendment Dated: January 24, 2005 Reply to Office Action mailed September 24, 2004 Attorney Docket No. 3036/50901

please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 05-1323 (Docket #3036/50901).

Respectfully submitted,

Gary R. Edwards

Registration No. 31,824

CROWELL & MORING LLP Intellectual Property Group

P.O. Box 14300

Washington, DC 20044-4300 Telephone No.: (202) 624-2500

Facsimile No.: (202) 628-8844

GRE:kms 357139v1